



LINKING SECTORS, ADVANCING SYSTEMS

Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day

Summary of Roundtable Discussions

June 7, 2008

The following table provides a summary of state participants' comments during roundtable discussions. Click on the topics listed below to link directly to that specific summary.

- [Accessing higher education and degrees, and supporting articulation](#)
- [Addressing needs and barriers through cross-sector workforce access and supports](#)
- [Professional development systems and quality rating and improvement systems \(QRIS\)](#)
- [Impacts of professional development on quality outcomes and environments](#)
- [Building and supporting a diverse workforce: Cultural and linguistic issues](#)
- [Building and supporting a diverse workforce: Supporting children with special needs](#)
- [Intersection of professional standards with standards for children](#)
- [Public will and policy: Influencing policy and funding decisions](#)
- [Compensation and connecting with and engaging new partners](#)
- [Systems change and growth: Strategies to regain momentum and re-energize planning and moving from planning to implementation](#)
- [Systems change and growth: Moving components to a system of professional development](#)
- [Status/process lessons learned: Planning and/or implementing cross-sector components or a cross-sector system](#)
- [Status/process lessons learned: Systems evaluation and effectiveness](#)

Topic	Discussion Summary
Accessing higher education and degrees, and supporting articulation	Benefits: Articulation means students don't take the same course twice, which results in a better use of state scholarships funded by tax dollars.
	Successes: States strategies that have worked include using a common curriculum across all community colleges, focusing on competency-based and core knowledge, and apprenticeship programs. Relationships facilitate articulations.
	Challenges: States have faced challenges such as programs not having sufficient content at the pre-K level. They identified a need to change focus from institution-centered to student-centered. In addition, there is often no birth-to-five credential.
	Lessons Learned: States have learned that policy can't always come first--it often grows from collaboration and experience across sectors.
	Next Steps: To keep moving forward, states need to develop a database of outside facilitators, and need to determine who from what states could help them.

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Addressing needs and barriers through cross-sector workforce access and supports</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Benefits: The biggest benefit of cross-sector efforts is creating multiple pathways—creating and maintaining a shared common target market of children and outcomes based on children.</p> <p>Successes: Connecticut brought together 2- and 4-year colleges to outline the communication breakdowns in the system. They discovered that state certification puts pressure on 4-year institutions, which in turn bear down on 2-year institutions. They have developed liaisons to help navigate conversations regarding certification. They are working on developing an alternate pathway through which a 4-year degree combined with a certificate would be sufficient to teach in an early childhood setting. In addition, the state’s required configuration of teachers mirrors Head Start.</p> <p>Pennsylvania has a two-tiered system. The level of credentialing needed by trainers varies with the nature of the training provided.</p> <p>Massachusetts created the Building Careers grant program. This creates a funding mechanism for higher education to offer free courses for aligning course content with state guidelines and NCATE, and builds a cohort of eager learners.</p> <p>Washington State created Building Bridges with Higher Education. This program provides courses with free tuition and materials and helps to mentor practitioners into higher education.</p> <p>Washington, D.C. provides mentor support for practitioners who are pursuing a sequence of professional development. There is a unique configuration for individuals working with children with special needs.</p> <p>The New Jersey Department of Education is funding NIEER to identify who is in the workforce and their levels of professional development—this information is also available from the state’s registry. In addition, the state has just initiated a cross-sector professional development effort. The initial meeting included identification of barriers and facilitators, and will now move to access and supports.</p> <p>Illinois has created Gateways to Opportunity, which includes a 48 hour training targeted to non-regulated child care.</p> <p>Additional general strategies that have shown success: Peer-to-peer and modified cohorts work are successful strategies when implementing professional development opportunities. Inviting all parties, including the ‘right people’ is key to successful cross-function collaboration. Maintaining a systems approach in a project-driven arena helps eliminate duplicate initiatives. Building a base of commonalities is a key first step to building cross-sector collaborations. Other states have had success marketing to families, telling them “if you want good child care, look for this credential.”</p>
	<p>Challenges: Every group has a different need/priority, which can be a barrier. The situation may look simple, but underneath it is actually more complex. Those providing professional development and those receiving it have different priorities, and there is often a difference in what people want or think they need and what is available to them. The challenge then is to determine how systems can move toward collaboration between those providing the professional development and those receiving it. Community colleges have advisory committees that bring together both sides of the system. Work with faculty can be delicate, in that it is important to give faculty positive messages about the work they are doing. It is also important to know who is participating in the system, particularly whether providers of unregulated child care are part of the system.</p> <p>We need to understand the sectors, what their capacity is, what their resources are. Too often access to professional development is inequitable. There is a difference in working with a child care program with a tiny professional development budget versus a public pre-K program in which teachers are paid and substitutes are provided.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Addressing needs and barriers through cross-sector workforce access and supports</p> <p>(cont'd)</p>	<p>Challenges (cont'd): Technology is also an issue. In one state, there was a huge computer giveaway, but the question is where the computers are now and what they are being used for.</p> <p>States shared a wide range of challenges in cross-sector efforts, including points relating to training (the cost and schedule of training, tuition, and transportation; access and support; getting information to potential participants about availability; determining whether training articulates to other opportunities; and determining who is qualified to administer community based training—in Texas, there is no law or requirement regarding who can administer that training.) We need to determine whether the system is too punitive in terms of requiring re-training of talented trainers without backgrounds in early childhood.</p> <p>Various other issues were discussed, including: career counseling, using the CDA credential as a pathway, the split between early care and education, whether QRIS will apply across all providing entities and different needs for child care and school systems. Some worried that the worst professional behaviors often emerge in times that are lean. Participants also have observed the pitfalls of a lack of collaboration, in that great plans are generated but don't get implemented.</p> <p>Texas wanted to know if there are opportunities for shared professional development systems. Others stated that functional areas are largely defined by funding streams and contracts, which makes it difficult to share resources in most cases. Also, quality control of shared elements is a challenge. Other states wanted to hear about experiences with implementing and finding funding for workforce studies, states supports for compensation and subsidies, and how to ensure that the bottom line in any professional development system is having staff who work in a child-focused manner.</p> <p>Lessons Learned: Attendees acknowledged that we have been afraid of setting high standards for our field—we don't want to eliminate anyone. We need to acknowledge disconnects; e.g., in Massachusetts, the higher education system does not have the capacity to support the professional development sequence they have designed.</p> <p>Articulation agreements are a key to respectful and successful conversations.</p>
<p>Professional development systems and quality rating improvement systems (QRIS)</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Background and State Activities: Mississippi based its QRIS system on North Carolina's, and both systems are tied to tiered reimbursements. In Michigan, a Bachelor's degree is required to move through the QRIS. Louisiana's QRIS involves a system of tax credits. California has a statewide CPIN (California Preschool Instructional Network) for pre-K.</p> <p>QRIS are evolving throughout the nation and there appears to be a lot of energy focusing on this issue. One issue that plagues many of the states is "politics." It was reported that politics are interfering with implementing QRIS and other early childhood systems. In Montana the Legislature meets every two years. The QRS proposal has already been denied even before the opening session. New Jersey is in the pilot phase of implementing their QRIS system, and wants to know how to actively engage the community and secure funding through the business community. The Abbot initiative in New Jersey (a court mandated initiative to ensure that economically disadvantaged children have the right to high quality care and education) will subside this year.</p> <p>New York reported that they seek private funding for their QRIS system, which has moved it forward significantly. The business community is stepping forward to fund the initiative.</p> <p>There are just a few states fully implementing a QRIS system, including Oklahoma, Idaho, and to some extent Illinois. South Carolina reports that they tried to implement without success, but they have modified it and are beginning to implement it again with much more success.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Professional development systems and quality rating improvement systems (QRIS) (cont'd)</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Background and State Activities (cont'd): Economic impact reports have been completed in some states. Alaska distributed their report to the round table participants. They are aligning their early learning guidelines to QRIS. In New Jersey the accreditation standards are woven in the professional development and education, which aligns with QRIS.</p> <p>Georgia is moving towards national accreditation for their centers. They are working with technical schools to provide professional development, and researching how to sustain the program until it becomes a system. Idaho is also implementing a pilot QRIS project. They asked for volunteers to participate and completed the initial assessment. They assigned coaches for a year, then reassessed. They want to take the initiative statewide, but need to solicit funding from the business community. In Pennsylvania, everything is leveraged through QRIS.</p> <p>Successes: States shared examples of what has worked for them, including Oklahoma’s data collection system, biyearly legislative sessions, and support of CCR&R agencies, registries, and education. New York and Illinois have entered an alliance, and report success with business, Docs for Tots, and Fight Crime, Invest in Kids.</p> <p>Successful strategies include: economic summits utilizing private funds; providing supports, incentives, and technical assistance; and using pilots when implementing QRIS systems.</p> <p>Challenges: States report challenges in bringing programs to scale, maintaining momentum, and ensuring program sustainability. Ensuring equity between rural, urban, and metro settings is also a challenge. In New Jersey, Abbot designation will subside due to court action on adequate education. Participants reported various strategies used to counteract these challenges. Oklahoma uses a mentoring program. Indiana reports effective use of access and outreach, with educators going out and use of independent contractors for technical assistance. Wisconsin has created a registry aligning competencies with NAEYC standards. Montana and Alaska have conducted Economic Impact studies and have engaged businesses in efforts. More general strategies were also mentioned, such as leveraging <i>everything</i> through the QRIS, phasing the program in, borrowing from states that are further along in the process, staying on top of other opportunities, and ensuring that all players (UPK, the registry, private for-profit providers) are at the table looking at standards.</p> <p>Lessons Learned: States such as Oklahoma, South Dakota, Indiana and Illinois have been able to respond by creating systems that meet local needs, i.e., the needs of county level management. States have learned that incentives are important to success, and that tiered reimbursement is an effective incentive. Three to five levels are needed to improve quality. Marketing is important but should be thoroughly thought out. QRIS systems that are tied to licensing are effective and efficient. Data collection is easier than mining existing data and producing useful reports. Valid assessment is crucial. There are different ways to utilize ERS at each level. Connections to other systems add efficiency and increase the potential sources of data—adding CCIS has lots of baseline data. Technical assistance is especially important in a 3-level system. Need to pay attention to the political climate and be cognizant of who gets credit—share the power.</p> <p>Pro-business legislation to improve quality may actually drive people out of business. Accreditation may be used at a high level, but there are multiple screening bodies—there needs to be a procedure in place to determine which will be used, and to ensure that accreditation is valuable. Participants advised to be careful not to lose the floor, and to be cautious about how you go public with the rating.</p> <p>Participants wish they had known from the start to build capacity, and ensure that those at the top give back. Other lessons include that mentors are vital for program implementation, and that it is necessary to include technical assistance in the system.</p> <p>Remaining Questions: Participants’ remaining questions involve the implementation of and connections with a registry—determining who needs it, and how to fit in Head Start. Some also wanted to know about NAEYC standards for trainers.</p> <p>Next Steps: Participants suggested developing a system in which families have equal access, and exploring using mentors or coaches. Some also mentioned asking for support from NAEYC in the form of state profiles, so that states can find out what other states are doing and how. Participants also decided to ask for distribution lists in order to have email chats. Participants want to schedule regular teleconferences on this topic.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Impacts of professional development on quality outcomes and environments</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Successes: Participants from several states stressed the importance of mentoring/coaching to support providers’ application of new knowledge in their work with children. On July 1st, Oklahoma is beginning a random assignment study in which center teachers in a control group will receive scholarships, while those in the treatment group will receive scholarships and mentoring/coaching. Tennessee also has a new Provider Self-Assessment and Mentoring Project.</p> <p>Louisiana shared their new legislation on tax credits for early childhood professionals, parents, centers, and businesses. Staff who work in licensed facilities receive bigger tax credits the higher the QRIS rating of the center, parents receive credits based on the ratings of the centers in which their children are enrolled, centers receive credits based on their ratings, and businesses can receive credits for donations to R&Rs. (This success/strategy is also part of the larger funding issues.)</p> <p>Participants from two states shared examples of efforts to evaluate the impact of training/professional development on providers and environments. New Mexico’s Train High project provides intensive training to centers struggling to meet basic licensing requirements; three months after the training ends, they return to assess improvements.</p> <p>Several community colleges in Washington evaluate their graduating AA students’ teaching using the CLASS instrument.</p> <p>Two other states shared examples of promising “embedded professional development” efforts—where credit-bearing courses are made available on site to the whole staff. One was in Milwaukee, with instruction from Cardinal Stritch Community College. These efforts—while well received—have not yet been evaluated.</p> <p>Challenges: Not sure what to make of information from pre- & post-tests of participants in training on their core curriculum, Connecticut decided they need to go back a step and evaluate the delivery of their training. They created an instrument (which they will share during an Institute session) to measure their trainers’ use of adult learning and other effective learning approaches. Trainers are observed unannounced. Findings from the observations will guide adjustments to selection, preparation, and support for trainers.</p> <p>Other states shared strategies for assuring quality training. Several states use a Train-the-trainer model—in Georgia, there are three levels of training for trainers, culminating in training on reflecting on/analyzing one’s own training. Oklahoma has 9 training modules for trainers, with pre- & post tests on each of the 9 content areas. Other states emphasized ongoing support for trainers—South Carolina organizes ongoing support groups and listservs for its certified trainers. There was a lot of enthusiasm in the group for ongoing TA and support for trainers. People pointed out that participants in major studies that show positive effects always seem to have had lots of support throughout the study period.</p> <p>Some felt that it is challenging to trace impacts of general professional development activities all the way to child outcomes. As we move from professional development’s impact on practitioner, to its impact on the setting, to its impact on the child, increasing numbers of additional factors can influence outcomes. A preference was expressed for evaluating impacts of provider professional development on child outcomes through specific research projects, rather than inferring them from assessments of all children in programs. This was related to some participants’ fear that assessing individual children could lead to labeling/tracking them.</p> <p>Other discussions focused on the importance of establishing associations between professional development and child outcomes than on the challenges/risks of doing so. A participant from Wisconsin noted that when measuring child outcomes, it is important to use consistent measures across programs and settings and suggested that our field can learn from the measurement trials and errors of early intervention Part B and C programs. On the other hand, in evaluating its SEED (System for Early Education Development) initiative, Alaska has not worried about consistent measures. They have relied on the varying instruments/data participating programs that they were already using to document big improvements in child outcomes. The SEED program makes major use of mentors, providing each Alaska Native participant with two—one from the early care and education profession and another elder from their community.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
Impacts of professional development on quality outcomes and environments (cont'd)	<p>Challenges (cont'd): Another challenge noted was that without the support of their center directors, teachers may well be unable to implement newly learned approaches in their classrooms. To address this challenge, states are designing training for administrators, involving them in training along with their teachers, and involving them in mentoring their staff. Directors are deliberately integrated into Tennessee’s new Provider Self-Assessment and Mentoring Project and in the centers participating in Oklahoma’s random assignment study. Wisconsin, responding in part to a big turnover in center directors, has developed an 18-credit director credential. Chip Donahue at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee is evaluating the credential.</p>
	<p>Lessons Learned: Lessons learned include being careful about language. A representative from New York voiced discomfort with using the words “training” and “trainer,” preferring “professional development” and responding favorably to Tennessee’s use of the word “specialist” rather than “trainer.”</p> <p>Participants called for research to understand which approaches to professional development work best with providers from different settings: center-based and home-based. Professional development also needs to be tailored to the needs and dispositions of the individuals receiving it.</p>
Building and supporting a diverse workforce: Cultural and linguistic issues (return to top)	<p>Successes: Hawaii has a model immersion preschool (www.ahapunaleo.org/), in which teachers who are Hawaiian natives receive exemptions from licensing regulations. Community colleges in Hawaii have been offering non-credit/credit conversion workshops in early childhood (PACE—Professional and Career Education for Early Childhood). Hawaii also has a set of core competencies for practitioners that includes cultural competencies.</p> <p>In New Mexico, two universities offer early childhood programs in Spanish with TEACH®, which has led to limited English proficient providers getting degrees. The programs use a dual language model, and have a strong social justice goal. Community colleges will also offer an English class with an early childhood focuses. Some classes follow learning communities and cohort models. The first four core classes will be CDA equivalent.</p>
	<p>Challenges: We have a divided workforce. We need more diversity among early childhood professionals, and need cultural competency in all teachers. Currently, teachers are not representative of children, and there is a lack of diversity in the workforce, especially in leadership positions. Institutions of higher education need to address this issue, and training must be culturally and linguistically appropriate for new populations.</p>
	<p>Hiring and retaining bilingual staff is one issue, and there is high turnover in this area. We need to encourage stability in the workforce. Families and new communities need to be integrated into the current population. Increasing credential and degree requirements can be exacerbating barriers to a diverse, professional workforce. Many have encountered discomfort with addressing institutional racism and social justice issues. Participants cited a need for cultural competency standards and standards for working with parents. We need to support pride in ethnicity and language, and help parents understand the importance of retaining home language. Higher education has some responsibility in giving teachers the capacity to deal with culture and language. We need formal structures in place to deal with these issues. People always feel reactive to this issue rather than proactive. In addressing this issue, we need to either recreate the structure of the system or design parallel pathways. We need to find a way to individualize professional development at all levels, while working on recruitment, retention, and meeting professional standards.</p>
	<p>Writing skills become a challenge for community colleges to teach, and we need to develop the skills of teachers in the classroom. Some need remedial or ESL coursework before taking early childhood courses, which is a barrier to education.</p>
	<p>Lessons Learned: Participants decided that the answer to the question of whether to address diversity issues informally or formally is formally: procedures need to be formalized and institutionalized.</p>
	<p>Next steps: NAEYC standards are a tool for resolving this issue. The language is there—states need to look to it and work language into professional development opportunities. We can also bring attention at the state level through Early Learning Councils. Other steps that would</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Building and supporting a diverse workforce: Supporting children with special needs</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>help move this issue along would be more leaders who have this as a high priority and enhanced accountability procedures.</p>
	<p>Benefits: The morning group identified several specific benefits. Families need support so they can be empowered to be long term supporters of their child—they are the constant in a child’s life. Services for children with special needs are fragmented, and this means staff does not get the support and/or education they need, and so they fail and leave the field. This makes teacher retention a very important issue. Finally, if children with special needs don’t get the support and education they need, they can’t become self-advocates later. So, this support is important for building a competent, capable citizenry.</p> <p>Successes: In Arkansas, the curriculum for the early childhood workforce is designed to support social/emotional development of young children. It aligns with CEUs and is required for all teachers in public school programs. The state uses train-the-trainer methods for teacher education.</p> <p>In Montana, each regional R&R has an Inclusion Specialist. They help programs with children with special needs and challenging behaviors using a consultation model, focus on helping child care programs adapt their facilities and interaction, but only income-eligible children can participate. This is tied to reimbursement in order to encourage providers to keep children. The inclusion specialists receive training twice a year.</p> <p>In Arkansas, behavioral interventionists have been hired by public schools to work with pre-K and kindergarten–4th grade. They are receiving training in early childhood.</p> <p>North Carolina has awarded two year grants to a total of 19 different Early Childhood community college courses. For the first time, inclusion is required to be embedded in each course.</p> <p>Oklahoma started RTI (Response to Intervention) model in pilot sites, some with pre-K. This tiered model provides support to teachers. The University of Oklahoma developed STARS EI training, which attracts practitioners from child care, Head Start, etc.</p> <p>Wisconsin has designated demonstration sites, funded by special education, for collaborated inclusion. Sites apply for planning and then implementation sites. When sites are approved, other community teams (with planning grants) visit to see practices.</p> <p>Several states have had success using families as professional development resources. Wisconsin started a Family Resource Directory, which catalogues families who can come to classes as presenters. New Mexico has “family as leaders” to serve on policy boards. In Arkansas, parents are part of community training teams as both trainers and trainees. A special education program in Massachusetts brings in parents as adjunct faculty. This pushed inclusion options and opened up the idea of Head Start.</p> <p>States also shared how they built cross-sector support for these successes: Wisconsin did a “3-2-1 analysis.” They identified three new collaboration ideas, two things to continue and collaborate on, and one thing they won’t do anymore. (They chose to stop only inviting their own audience.) Four different agencies contribute funding, but major funding comes from State Improvement Grant from OSEP for disabilities. The state identified a need to have assertive players at the table when the SIG grant is written. In New Mexico, the effort was funded by a federal grant to the University of New Mexico. The Parents Reaching Out and Family Voices organizations have been historically strong. They are training parents to be strong advocates and leaders. The state is unsure what will happen when the grant ends. In Alaska, EI and SIG funding supports training. Many states have active ICC councils that provide structure for collaboration, including with parents.</p> <p>Challenges: Children with non-demanding needs may get overlooked, while using too many pull-out services maintains the fragmentation that inclusion seeks to avoid. The competencies, credentials, and support needed for the consultants, specialists, and trainers who provide professional development are not articulated. When teachers don’t receive adequate training, they can feel like failures.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Building and supporting a diverse workforce: Supporting children with special needs</p> <p>(cont'd)</p>	<p>Challenges (cont'd): Some states have had difficulty in getting sectors such as pre-K, Head Start, and child care out of silos and cooperating. Commitment to children with special needs is uneven across sectors, and different sectors have different priorities and opinions. School readiness programs (pre-K) want to support inclusion and need help doing it from others, such as the Department of Education, but the Department of Education may use a segregated approach.</p> <p>For children who spend time in two settings (i.e., child care and special education), a lack of continuity between sectors such as child care and public schools may pose a problem. Professional development is needed in all settings, but sectors have separate professional development initiatives. Getting cross-sector training related to inclusion to everyone who needs it is a challenge.</p> <p>Other identified challenges included accountability, and finding a way to assess/monitor child progress is a way that “honors” families’ contributions and documents programs in meaningful ways</p> <p>Lessons Learned: We pushed hard for inclusion, especially the parents. However, we didn’t build the infrastructure to support staff, and now there is a backlash. States have learned not to push inclusion without appropriate planning and infrastructure support for teachers and children. Teachers need training and support.</p> <p>Next steps: Getting parents involved, and keeping updated on the efforts of other states. The group suggested using mechanisms like this meeting to get all issues on the table, and all perspectives shared. The group wants to keep communicating.</p>
<p>Intersection of professional standards with standards for children</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Benefits: Outcomes drive the entire cross system effort—a number of states have alignment of many pieces of the system, but nothing overarching that provides an impetus for forward movement. Need to identify/develop incentives at each level to provide momentum.</p> <p>We need to align professional development with state early learning standards. The competencies and professional development that teachers are required to have should be those that will give them the ability to help children meet standards. Child outcomes also need to match with standards and professional development, so that we know that the standards we are asking children to meet are providing the best outcomes possible, and that professional development helps teachers facilitate those outcomes. Professional development needs to match with what we want children to be gaining.</p> <p>Successes: Participants identified successes in developing individual and personal relationships, in particular regarding articulation between AA and BS/BA degree programs. In some cases, all AA programs within a state have banded together to craft articulation with BS/BA programs. There has been some success in bringing more players to the table, including birth-3yrs representation.</p> <p>Other states have had success working below the traditional radar e.g., addressing articulation through non traditional routes like distance education, and determining whether there are adjacent states with reciprocity.</p> <p>Challenges: Participants identified areas which remain challenging, such as compensation and teacher licensing. We need a career ladder that compensates staff as they attain more training, coursework, and experience, so they do not leave ECE for kindergarten or public school positions. There have been some changes in state legislation to permit pre-K certification without a teaching license. There is some debate as to whether this is a positive step, or if it disadvantages our students.</p> <p>New legislation e.g. , kith and kin/family, friend, and neighbor care can add complexity to the picture; not all direct care providers want or desire professionalization of their roles (e.g., in Hawaii, South Dakota).</p> <p>Lessons Learned: University and community college ECE programs seem to hold the key to integration of programs, professional performance, and child outcomes. We need to avoid accountability that marks rigid and scripted pre-K curricula. In addition, being embraced by K-12 meant an emphasis of the pushdown of elementary curriculum to 0 to 5, sometimes inherent in state legislation because of teacher certification requirements.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Intersection of professional standards with standards for children</p> <p>(cont'd)</p>	<p>Next Steps: Future steps include at the state level include marketing a comprehensive understanding of ECE to legislators. To help move things forward, require certification for ECE directors. To build on what has been done well and move ahead, plan comprehensive and longitudinal research to determine effectiveness of approaches that tie child outcomes with outcomes of professional development. We need to examine additional way to measure teacher performance beyond classroom inventory.</p> <p>The CLASS program in Indiana has a focus on teacher/child interactions and the conditions and teacher qualifications that foster children’s outcomes.</p>
<p>Public will and policy— influencing policy and funding decisions</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Background and Activities: In several states, those working for early education professional development policies have worked together with those in other fields, such as in San Francisco with human service providers. Some have had success with tying policies into the population caring for aging. In Washington State, there is an emphasis on home visiting. In Iowa, the Iowa empowerment office brief supports a variety of activities, including preschool. In New Jersey, however, teacher competencies are linked regardless of sector.</p> <p>Participants found that national studies have been terrifically helpful, but cited a need to get people to see professional development as a long term concern.</p> <p>Alaska has seen growth and strengthening in AEYC and the Head Start Association; SEED (System for Early Education Development) brings more communities together. Alaska also mentioned a need for data driven action.</p> <p>In New Mexico, advocacy started among pre-K has brought different sectors together, such as public, private, and Head Start. The sectors have common standards, and 20% of funding for pre-K goes to professional development.</p> <p>In California, a pending bill would tie QRIS to reimbursements and set up a Blue Ribbon commission. In California, a public will education campaign has been very successful. California believes that it doesn’t matter who carries the message, but that there must be a compelling story based on data. California already has a broad coalition. California has a government agency that deals with birth to five, and is trying to consolidate funding streams. However, no one advocacy group has been very successful in educating the legislature, and the child care tracking system in licensing is not associated with the early childhood agency. States share that studies of different wages across sectors are needed, and advocates need to determine the identity of their audience, and avoid doing negative stories, but use messages that leave their audience looking at things in a different way. Two things stimulate change: money and adversity.</p> <p>In Massachusetts, state and federal funding streams to professional development for Head Start, public school, and licensed child care differ. Massachusetts has many advocacy organizations, which have been accused of not having one voice.</p> <p>Montana has a strong professional development registry, with high participation, but is having trouble partnering early childhood with the Office of Public Instruction.</p> <p>In Tennessee, the governor’s office on child care coordination gives a cross sectors look at distributing TANF funds, and the state is going to use the same funds for professional development. The lottery only funds the Hope Scholarship and there are lots of unused funds.</p> <p>Indiana complains of a lack of statewide vision for early childhood—they have a campaign, and providers that engage in professional development love it, but professional development is voluntary to get to standards. The advocacy community in Indiana is considered “liberal,” and is not taken seriously by the legislature.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Public will and policy— influencing policy and funding decisions</p> <p>(cont'd)</p>	<p>Challenges: This area is mostly child focused, and professional development is more under the radar. This poses a challenge: we can come across as self-serving when asking for funding for professional development. Participants say focusing on professional development is difficult. Yet, other initiatives focus on public will and policy, such as home visiting and minimum wage.</p> <p>States encountered challenges from gubernatorial leadership, as well as from programs that think their teachers are doing fine as they are. There have been difficulties in the process of determining who we want in our own workforce versus who is there, as well as prioritizing between those with degrees and those who have been in the field for a long time. Other challenges include integrating birth to five systems work, and implementing the Build Initiative, ECEs, and Title V. Most states haven't considered infant/toddler professional development.</p> <p>Iowa fears a threat to their professional development from a lack of coordination—each government leader wants to leave their own mark, and there is no standard amount of funding for professional development—it is determined by each individual district.</p> <p>Lessons Learned: Different messages about professional development are needed depending on the audience. In Washington, early education providers participate in Kids Matters, a privately funded broad coalition of providers including early childhood education, health, and home visiting. However, early childhood advocates fear that professional development will not be a priority in such a broad coalition.</p> <p>Next steps: Participants agreed that we need to define our workforce for ourselves so that others don't define it for us. Washington is using Ready or Not Leadership Choices to determine who is in the field and who is being served.</p>
<p>Compensation and connecting with and engaging new partners</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Challenges: Part of why we have so much to do around workforce development is because we have poor retention in the field. And there is a great concern that higher education advances will be rendered null because people will leave the field. Also, there is concern about how ECE within higher education is suffering from poor compensation too—that there are too many adjuncts, heavy student loads, no pipeline to create new instructors, and no new faculty positions.</p> <p>In Wisconsin, several hundred teachers and providers are scheduled to get BA degrees this spring and there is fear they will leave the field because there is no money to increase their wages.</p> <p>New Mexico is a poor state, and federal money is unreliable. When people get more education, especially degrees, they move out of child care to other children's services or public schools.</p> <p>Connecticut is a wealthy state, but still grappling with this issue. Law passed that by 2015 teachers had to have a BA degree. Planning imploded because people can't figure out the compensation. The state is giving signing bonuses, but still having a hard time getting people to teach.</p> <p>People think North Carolina has it worked out because of WAGES\$, but the amount of money they give people isn't enough by itself. They need at least \$6000 for BA teachers.</p> <p>Lessons Learned: Do homework before connecting so you know something about others' assumptions. When joining a new group, spend time listening to learn the culture. Be attuned to the way language is used differently and come up with common understanding (e.g. professional development in ECE is different than in K-12). Keep fights inside your groups before you reach beyond. Some leaders need assistance in transitioning out to give others room.</p> <p>Next Steps: The discussion mostly focused on the importance of NAEYC leadership through the Policy Blueprint on this issue.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Systems change and growth: Strategies to regain momentum and re-energize planning and moving from planning to implementation</p>	<p>Benefits: Participants cited a number of benefits of systems thinking and theory, including reducing duplication, establishing a problem-solving process, maximizing resources, and having a common registry and language alignment (knowledge and core competencies).</p>
	<p>Successes: Several strategies were suggested, including creating a “collective leadership” model to guide the work of the group, and using a “carrot and stick” approach in balance. Participants also advised that the group must all agree on a common desired outcome, and that leadership needs to be engaged at the highest public policy level. One strategy mentioned is to create a professional development taskforce or work group to keep work moving forward. Others mentioned the need to seek out more private funding to move the professional development plan forward. Participants mentioned the United Way Foundation as a potential funder.</p>
	<p>Challenges: Participants cited difficulty in letting go of past issues and baggage. One state created a professional development system, but then did not move forward with the plan. Some states have experienced leadership changes which impacted implementation of the professional development plan. For some, problems in the communication system mean that a common message is not being sent to the field. Others have had to cope with limited resources and workforce.</p>
	<p>Lessons Learned: Make sure to set goals, objectives, and next steps during the planning process, identifying who will do what, by when, and with what resources. Others suggested requiring explicit agreements from participating member organizations to stay involved. Be inclusive and transparent during the planning and feedback process to get buy-in during the implementation plan.</p>
	<p>Next Steps: Participants identified a need to articulate desired results with clarity and unity, and to identify and create quality models for others to see. Discussions also included ongoing evaluation, continuously identifying who is responsible for what and noting what was done. Prioritize the next steps in the planning process to implementation.</p>
<p>Systems change and growth: Moving components to a system of professional development</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Background and Activities: Mississippi described a plan for interagency emergency preparedness that groups worked together to produce. The state’s Quality Rating System has a heavy emphasis on professional development.</p> <p>Illinois has begun to connect components of various initiatives to improve quality. For example, the newly created professional development system has created ECE credentials at 5 levels. The level 1 credential for entry level practitioners is now tied in with the Quality Counts QRS for license-exempt providers. The level 1 credential represents 48 clock hours of training; if a license-exempt provider attains this credential, their subsidy rate is increased by 15%. Another aspect of Illinois’ efforts to build a comprehensive system is that a minimum of a BA plus early childhood certification is required for all pre-K teachers funded by Preschool for All. This is regardless of whether the teacher is working in public school or community-based settings.</p> <p>Oklahoma said all the money is made available to the schools. Planning for pre-K falls back on the local partners and is based on relationships. They need to be aware of what resources are available and what the funding is. The challenge is to think creatively. The lottery has helped with the funding formula bringing in more revenue to pay for 14 grades in public schools now.</p> <p>Wisconsin has Early Childhood Collaboration Partners including sharing funding from IDEA, Head Start, homelessness, workforce development and other sources. A regional action team shares priorities and actions and hires regional collaboration coaches. Partnerships and the principle of “follow the money” are encouraged.</p> <p>The California Preschool Initiative rolls out CDD initiatives and Early Childhood Foundations, which are the early learning standards. The Faculty Initiative Project provides information and seminars on the new Foundations and offers guidelines. All early childhood programs have been merged into a Department of Education, Child Development Division. To bring community college faculty on board and ready to teach the new Foundations, researchers from around the country discussed the need for early childhood standards at special faculty trainings.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Systems change and growth: Moving components to a system of professional development</p> <p>(cont'd)</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Washington described a Parent Companion Guide unfolding the Early Learning Standards for whatever settings children were in. The benchmarks were developed jointly by the State Department of Education and the Early Learning Department. The goal is that quality rating systems are tied to professional development. Washington changed administrative structure to a State Department of Early Learning two years ago. This is supporting system coordination. They have focused energy on licensing, QRIS (pilot begins in September 08), pre-K, ECSE, and registry. The professional development system is “waiting.”</p> <p>Several states described methods by which their students can transfer credit from CDAs into an associate degree program. It is easiest when the CDA has college credit from the beginning. Florida has an initiative by which CEUs can be transferred into a formal program through articulation agreements.</p> <p>Maine has a formal articulation agreement with the Resource and Referral agencies, two-year colleges, and universities. Providers can transfer their 180 hours of training or CDA into college credit. The community colleges and many private two-year colleges also have articulation agreements with the university system so students come in as juniors if they have a two-year degree. Early Childhood Higher Education meets regularly to discuss new courses, common problems and ideas in the field. This includes representatives from state agencies as well as training personnel and professors from associate’s, bachelor’s and master’s programs in the state.</p> <p>Massachusetts’ Scholarship Program is open to licensed, pre-K, or faith-based teachers for an associate’s or bachelor’s degree. There are no income limitations; students just need to be matriculated in either an early childhood or related degree program to be eligible.</p> <p>Illinois had the TEACH® program but has recently adopted a new scholarship model (Gateways to Opportunity Scholarships) without the partnership requirement for the program site. This requirement was proving to be difficult because often programs couldn’t afford the compensation component of the TEACH® model. With the Illinois model, the individual makes a contract directly with the state. There will also be a much higher income eligibility ceiling for the student practitioner, making this scholarship available to practitioners earning more than \$15.00/hr (especially critical for those living in metropolitan areas or who have been in the field for some time.)</p> <p>Tennessee offers education funded directly through the state and not income-based. All training is “free” to the individual (any child care employee can enroll with a 15% investment which is refunded upon completion). Tennessee offers a bonus for certified programs that move up in star rating systems and for director and teacher quality.</p> <p>Louisiana offers various School Readiness Tax Credits, including: credits for families who enroll children in centers with quality rating; credits for teachers and directors who work in centers participating in QRS; and credits for business or centers that participate in QRS. A teacher is eligible for a differential, refundable, tax credit if the person obtains a CDA, AA, BA, or MS and works for certain length of time in a program participating in the QRIS, which is a voluntary approach to improving quality in LA. As an incentive to stay with the same child care program, teachers and directors get paid for each year and educational level they have reached after the first six months. Payments go up \$500 each level in center-based care. For a CDA, teachers receive \$1500.</p> <p>Vermont, Colorado, and North Carolina discussed linking public pre-K funding and training. In Kansas the pre-K money flows through the state and all pre-K sites must participate in the QRIS to be funded. Pre-Ks can be located in schools or community sites.</p> <p>In Iowa the QRIS is a voluntary rating system working off two years of grants. Money flows through districts and includes faith-based sites. The University Extension helped with implementation of the environmental rating scales. Assessment is free if participating in the QRIS and T/TA helps sites increase scores. She said grant money is available to help sites but providers need to be creative.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Status/process lessons learned: Planning and/or implementing cross-sector components or a cross-sector system</p>	<p>Background and Activities: By cross-sector, we mean that the planning team should include representatives of cross-sector agencies, and identify common competencies and training that applies to all/could benefit all.</p> <p>In North Carolina, things are coming together, but there are still some silos and some partners are missing. The NC PDI is focused on a more formal, credit-bearing route. The state needs to figure out where non-credit training fits into the professional development system, and who else needs to be at the table.</p> <p>In Arkansas, governance started in the Head Start Collaboration Office and moved to a non-profit within a higher education institution. Arkansas used the development of a strategic plan as a method to engage partners. Arkansas’ system started in 1988. Higher education committees created Pathways, but didn’t conduct evaluations and couldn’t retrieve information about the system. Data was being collected, but the state wasn’t getting anything out of it. The state discovered that they needed to decide what they wanted to know and what data they needed to collect, across sectors, agencies, and divisions within the state government. One result was that they began to evaluate the training that was paid for by CCDF.</p> <p>In Connecticut, a Governor’s Cabinet workforce committee learned that it takes 6 years for those with a CDA to complete a bachelor’s degree.</p> <p>New Mexico has a fully articulated professional development system. All ECE courses are based on the Common Core.</p> <p>West Virginia was able to form relationships with higher education via a higher education/community college consortium. Bringing in outside consultants helped move them forward. In addition, a Governor’s Cabinet in the state established pre-K. Funding for pre-K provides equity between equally trained and educated teachers, regardless of the program. Programs receive a higher rate for implementing pre-K. The subsidy program has requirements for wages and benefits for participating child care programs.</p> <p>In New Jersey, Abbott districts had time constraints to meet the requirements for teachers with bachelor’s degrees. The time constraints eliminated the least resourced practitioners.</p> <p>West Virginia uses a Training Approval System. Trainers are included in the Registry and must meet certain qualifications for training to count for credit.</p> <p>In Massachusetts, international standards are awarded CEUs. The standards include requirements for instructor qualifications, contact hours and demonstration of knowledge.</p> <p>In Wisconsin, different agencies often duplicate work because they don’t know what the other agencies are doing. Wisconsin created a grid of professional development and services to children from various agencies as a starting point for communication and cross-sector work. By using checkboxes, they identified the overlaps and gaps.</p> <p>Vermont conducted a comparison of all program requirements (licensing, subsidy, Head Start).</p> <p>In Montana, the original system was inclusive of “traditional” ECE sectors. There was entry level training and coursework/degree from higher education, but no middle level training. Now the state is looking to cross-sector partners to meet this need, including early intervention and infant mental health organizations. While in the process of moving to a more cross-sector system, states need to continually examine what kinds of trainings are needed and what new partnerships are needed to meet the training needs.</p> <p>(return to top)</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Status/process lessons learned: Planning and/or implementing cross-sector components or a cross-sector system</p> <p>(cont'd)</p>	<p>Background and Activities (cont'd): In Florida, child care is part of the state workforce development agency. It is a county-driven system and some counties have more advanced systems than the State. There are multiple initiatives and funders. Because of the county system, the issues for developing a statewide system are complex.</p> <p>In California, higher education partnerships are organized by regions, due to differences between the regions and the size of the state. These regional groupings allow for unique solutions to regional needs, addressing articulation and other professional development needs. The system allows for variations and alternatives to meeting the standards.</p> <p>Delaware developed the first professional development workforce plan. The state recently moved administration of the system from social services to the Department of Education.</p> <p>Participants mentioned various articulation models/methods: 2-year to 4-year – up-side-down: take most general education courses at the 4-year institution which accepts early childhood courses from 2-year college; School of Human Sciences bachelor’s can teach pre-K and K; DOL-Apprenticeship, Tech-Prep, Perkins Funds, Workforce Investment Act funds – can support articulation, educational and career advancement.</p> <p>Lessons Learned: Everyone needs to start somewhere. Look at all the different program requirements and standards. Look at the workforce—who they are, what they need, their commonalities and differences. Determine commonalities across roles, age groupings, and settings. Think about governance—determine where the system will reside, and who has decision-making authority. The host agency needs to have the capacity for the system to grow and expand.</p> <p>Funding and expertise is an important factor in moving forward. States need to look forward, rather than just concentrating on what is going on now. We need to learn to speak business language, and invite funders and business leadership to be a part of systems building. The business community is interested in good child care, which motivates them to participate in professional development efforts. Florida points out that because they are in the workforce development office, they get the benefit of economic forecasting, and business thinking and data. Several states have written Economic Impact Reports, including Montana, Alaska, and Florida. The language and messages in these reports are targeted at funders and decision-makers.</p>
<p>Status/process lessons learned: Systems evaluation and effectiveness</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Benefits: We need data on the effectiveness of the professional development system in order to be a good steward of state money. Systems evaluation is necessary for making well-informed decisions that lead to improvement. When fighting for money, we need evidence that it is being effectively used and data is a useful and efficient way to show this. The early childhood education system is so complex—health, Part C, Part B, child care, Head Start, protective services, state pre-K, higher education—that a system of evaluation is critical for making cross-sector decisions.</p> <p>Successes: South Carolina is on the verge of implementing a child level tracking system. South Carolina is in the final stages of linking data to a state data warehouse, and is working to determine common identifiers.</p> <p>New York City has conducted a workforce census and also a review of teacher credentials which revealed not all teachers were in compliance with degree requirements.</p> <p>Challenges: The state of the science is limited: in a few places, we have databases that count elements (e.g. credentials, course work, professional development hours, and teacher background characteristics) but often this is just for one sector of ECCE. No full evaluation systems are known.</p>

NAEYC Second Annual State Professional Development Leadership Team Work Day: Summary of Roundtable Discussions

Topic	Discussion Summary
<p>Status/process lessons learned: Systems evaluation and effectiveness (cont'd)</p> <p>(return to top)</p>	<p>Challenges (cont'd): In many cases, state budgets are inadequate to conduct evaluation of the system. Most evaluations are done internally, rather than by an external evaluator. States share concerns that leaps are being made from the type and quality of professional development to child outcome expectations that are unreasonable and dangerous. We need consistent definitions across sectors, and should consider going beyond traditional data collection points when surveying staff. We should provide midpoint indicators to guide states to move on a continuum. A few states mentioned that small amounts of funds for external evaluations are being used—Tennessee uses TANF money.</p> <p>Participants identified challenges in linking the data silos, getting the data to the child level outcomes, developing a template for an optimal data system, overcoming self report issues (using verified data) and linking training and technical assistance to quality improvement.</p> <p>Lessons Learned: New York City has learned to make sure if you set standards that you have a means to enforce and monitor them.</p> <p>Next Steps: <i>Can a Professional Development System Track/Demonstrate Improvements in Child Outcomes?</i> We need to identify what existing systems show, and be able to use the database to show that regulations are being met. Standardized data sets are useful when they benefit the individual early childhood professional, and let them see how close they are to the next goal.</p>